

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**LAWRENCE E. SCIBLE,**

**Petitioner,**

**v.**

**Civil Action No. 2:04cv92**

**WILLIAM HAINES, Warden,**

**Respondent.**

**ORDER**

It will be recalled that on May 13, 2005, Respondent filed a Consolidated Answer, Motion for Summary Judgment, Motion to Dismiss and Memorandum in Support. On May 24, 2005, Petitioner filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. On August 31, 2005, Magistrate Judge Kaull filed his Report and Recommendation regarding the Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, the Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment and Motion to Dismiss, and the Petitioner's Motion for Summary Judgment, wherein the parties were directed, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), to file with the Clerk of Court any written objections within ten (10) days after being served with a copy of the Report and Recommendation. On September 29, 2005, the Court received the Petitioner's Objections to Report and Recommendation.

Upon examination of the report from the Magistrate Judge, it appears to the Court that the issues raised by the Petitioner in his Petition For Writ of Habeas Corpus, filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, and the issues raised by the Respondent in his Motion for Summary Judgment and Motion to Dismiss, as well as the issues raised by the Petitioner in his Motion for Summary Judgment, were all thoroughly considered by Magistrate Judge Kaull in his Report and Recommendation. Furthermore, upon careful

consideration of the Petitioner's objections, it appears to the Court that the Petitioner has not raised any issues that were not thoroughly considered by Magistrate Judge Kaull in his Report and Recommendation. Moreover, the Court, upon an independent de novo consideration of all matters now before it, is of the opinion that the Report and Recommendation accurately reflects the law applicable to the facts and circumstances before the Court in this action. Therefore, it is

**ORDERED** that Magistrate Judge Kaull's Report and Recommendation be, and the same hereby is, accepted in whole and that this civil action be disposed of in accordance with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, it is

**ORDERED** that Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment and Motion to Dismiss shall be, and the same hereby are, **GRANTED**. It is further

**ORDERED** that Petitioner Lawrence E. Scible's Motion for Summary Judgment be, and the same hereby is, **DENIED**. It is further

**ORDERED** that the petition of Lawrence E. Scible, filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2254 be, and the same hereby is, **DENIED**. It is further

**ORDERED** that the above-styled action be, and the same hereby is, **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** and **STRICKEN** from the docket of this Court. It is further

**ORDERED** that the Clerk shall enter judgment for the Respondent. It is further

**ORDERED** that Petitioner's motion for extension of time to file objections and motion to direct Huttonsville Correctional Center to make the computer available to prepare objections, filed on September 21, 2005, shall be, and the same hereby are, **DENIED as MOOT**. It is further

**ORDERED** that, if Petitioner should desire to appeal the decision of this Court,

written notice of appeal must be received by the Clerk of this Court within thirty (30) days from the date of the entry of the Judgment Order, pursuant to Rule 4, Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. The \$5.00 filing fee for the notice of appeal and the \$250.00 docketing fee should also be submitted with the notice of appeal. In the alternative, at the time the notice of appeal is submitted, Petitioner may, in accordance with the provisions of Rule 24(a), Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, seek leave to proceed in forma pauperis from the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

**ENTER:** January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2006

**/s/ Robert E. Maxwell**  
United States District Judge